When Foxes Rove: Jean Bouchet's *Regnars traversant*, Basel-Paris-Brussels-Frankfurt-Dresden

Adrian Armstrong

Queen Mary University of London

 This article first appeared in *Digital Philology*, Volume 10, Issue 2, Fall 2021, pages 174-198.

Abstract:

As Cynthia Brown's *Poets, Patrons, and Printers* has demonstrated, Jean Bouchet's *Regnars traversant* [*The Foxes that Rove*]—first published in Paris c. 1503 with a fraudulent attribution to Sebastian Brant—plays an important role in the development of author-publisher relations in France. It also poses edifying interpretive challenges to its readers. Its governing metaphor, the fox as an image of human vice and dishonesty, is developed through a set of enigmatic woodcuts that depict the narrator's visions, and that must be deciphered in conjunction with the accompanying text. Various motifs in the woodcuts derive from a 1497 broadside by Brant, published in German (and probably also in Latin). The *Regnars*' distinctive illustrations, and its combination of prose and verse, were no obstacle to further publication across linguistic, and sometimes confessional, boundaries. In 1517 Thomas van der Noot printed a Dutch version, *De loose vossen der werelt* [*The Treacherous Foxes of the World*], which he had probably translated himself. The *Loose vossen* was itself translated into High German, as *Von den losen füchsen dieser welt* [*The Treacherous Foxes of this World*], and published in 1546 by the Frankfurt

printer Hermann Gülfferich. Sixty years later an unlocalized edition appeared with copies of Gülfferich's images, some of them reversed. Matthes Stöckel published a revised edition, with a more pronounced Lutheran orientation, in Dresden in 1585. The successive translations and revisions are illustrated by increasingly elaborate woodcuts, and adopt different approaches to translating verse. I examine the ways in which text-image interactions evolve as the *Regnars* travels eastward, as well as the shifting configurations of verse forms and their meanings. The interplay of conservation and intervention across Dutch and German versions encourages reflection on what analytical tools might best elucidate the cross-cultural transmission of complex multimodal texts in early modern Europe.

As Cynthia Brown's *Poets, Patrons, and Printers* has demonstrated, the *Regnars traversan*t, an early work by the prolific Poitiers author Jean Bouchet (1476–1557?), plays a major part in the history of intellectual property in France.[1] It was first published c. 1503 as part of an anthology compiled by the well-established Parisian publisher Anthoine Vérard, and attributed not to the then-unknown Bouchet but to Sebastian Brant, the German satirist whose *Narrenschiff* [*Ship of Fools*] had been an international bestseller.[2] Bouchet brought a lawsuit against Vérard, and for the rest of his career took care to be quite closely involved with the printing of his work.[3] Despite his legal action, further editions of the anthology appeared over the next few decades, maintaining the attribution to Brant on their title pages; by contrast, Bouchet's own revised version of the *Regnars* never appeared in print.[4] As printed by Vérard and others, the *Regnars* combines narrative allegory with edifying poetry and a critique of contemporary society. The fox serves as a metaphor for human wickedness and dishonesty, which is modulated across a set of visions experienced by a first-person narrator. The narrator interprets each vision, together with one or more short biblical texts that accompany it, as standing for a particular group of human sinners. Each narrative account is introduced by a woodcut that depicts the vision and the associated biblical texts.

An important source of the *Regnars*' imagery is a broadside comprising a large woodcut and poem by none other than Brant. This survives in a 1497 German version, entitled *Von dem Fuchshatz* [*The Fox Hunt*]; Brant also composed a Latin version of the poem, *De spectaculo conflictuque vulpium alopekiomachia* [*Alopekiomachia, or the Spectacle and Battle of the Foxes*].[5] From the outset, in other words, the *Regnars* was a cross-cultural production. The same dynamic is apparent in its later reception: the work's distinctive illustrations, and its combination of prose and verse, were no obstacle to further publication across linguistic and/or confessional

boundaries. In 1517, the Brussels publisher Thomas van der Noot printed a Dutch version, *De loose vossen der werelt* [*The Treacherous Foxes of the World*], which he had probably translated himself.[6] No author is identified in the *Loose vossen*, nor in the High German versions that derive from it. The first of these was published in 1546 by the Frankfurt printer Hermann Gülfferich, as *Von den losen füchsen dieser welt* [*The Treacherous Foxes of this World*].[7] Sixty years later, an unlocalized edition appeared with copies of Gülfferich's images, some of them reversed.[8] Matthes Stöckel published a revised edition, with a more pronounced Lutheran orientation, in Dresden in 1585.[9] In what follows, I examine the evolution of the *Regnars* material from Brant to Stöckel, focusing in particular on text-image interactions and on the shifting configurations of verse forms and their meanings.[10]

My findings have implications for established models of multimodal translation, the translation of texts in which verbal, visual, and/or aural elements combine in complex ways to produce meanings that exceed the sum of the contributing elements.[11] These models assume that translations are aiming to achieve "interpretive resemblance," in other words to produce a meaning that is as close as possible to that of the source text, making allowances for different contexts of reception.[12] As will become clear in the course of my analysis, such paradigms cannot adequately elucidate the cross-cultural transmission of complex text-image combinations in early modern Europe; they must be enriched by philological perspectives. As such, the methodological contribution I seek to make is specifically to translation studies, and emphatically not—or at least not directly—to the distinct albeit related field of reception studies.[13]

I begin with *Von dem Fuchshatz*, which, like most chapters in the *Regnars*, presents a mysterious image that viewers must interpret in light of the text that follows. The image was

devised, though not executed, by Brant himself.[14] *Von dem Fuchshatz* delivers a veiled critique of the forces within the Holy Roman Empire that were resisting the authority of their sovereign Maximilian, and of the nobles who were disregarding the Eternal Public Peace, a ban on feuding imposed at the Diet of Worms in 1495.[15] The broadside was aimed at a general audience, whereas *De spectaculo* was directed more at decision-makers and opinion-formers: it was addressed explicitly to Maximilian. The Latin poem survives in a collection of Brant's religious and political poetry, *Varia carmina*, published a year after *Von dem Fuchshatz*. Both Brant poems make specific reference to details in the woodcut; it is therefore very likely that a Latin version of the broadside was also printed.[16] The *Regnars*, as we shall see, includes an extract from *De spectaculo* as well as some of the motifs from Brant's woodcut. Bouchet's direct source was presumably the now-lost Latin broadside, as it is difficult to imagine that he used *Von dem Fuchshatz* alongside the verse published in the *Varia carmina*.

Various elements in Brant's woodcut are taken up in one or other of the *Regnars* images, but are used quite differently. Scrolls bearing short vernacular texts, for example, play an important part in the *Fuchshatz*. They normally express the direct speech or thoughts of the figure that they accompany, such as the fox with a basket of tails depicted just below and to the left of the date at the top center: "Vil schwentz hab ich versamlet hie. / Ich teil sie bald, wer weiss noch wie?" ["I've collected plenty of tails here. I'll share them out soon; who knows how?"].[17] In the *Regnars*, by contrast, scrolls bear biblical quotations in Latin; these are not the words of figures within the scenes witnessed by Bouchet's narrator, but rather, comments on those scenes. Moreover, various animals in the *Fuchshatz* woodcut are interpreted differently from their counterparts in the *Regnars* (which I consider below). The tails in the fox's basket stand for tricks and deception, particularly as used by unscrupulous German barons. The lynx in

the left middle ground is using foxes to hunt other foxes, with little success: this represents the Imperial Archchancellor, Berthold von Henneberg, whose efforts at administrative reform Brant saw both as doomed to failure and as disloyal to Maximilian. The wild animals in the forest in the left foreground symbolize external threats to the Empire, as well as echoing biblical references to the Apocalypse and Last Judgment.[18]

The *Regnars* is introduced by the extract from *De spectaculo* (f. a1^{v}), which helps to establish readers' expectations for what follows. It largely comprises relatively commonplace moral arguments, for example that a fox can change its fur but not its nature, and that all too many humans are deceitful and malevolent like foxes. References to Maximilian, and to specific details of Brant's woodcut, are omitted. Four lines from the middle of the poem are moved to the beginning, thereby assuming especial importance; they invite readers to interpret the images carefully, and in conjunction with the text:

> Hec sibi quid picture velit, vel inane poema,
> Qui legis hec aures arrige queso pias.
> Plus tibi nam pictura fert quam carmina nostra
> Rauca.[19]
>
> [You who read this, please pay close attention to what this picture, or the little poem, is seeking to convey; for the picture will tell you more than our hoarse song.]

Bouchet underlines this principle of holistic reading more than once in the *Regnars* itself. In Chapter 2 his narrator urges readers to consider the various sections together, rather than

focusing selectively on particular groups of sinners: “en priant ceulx qui liront ce livre, que je nomme *Les Renars du monde*, qu’ilz ne lisent une partie sans l’autre, car ilz trouveront finablement que l’iniquité de tous les estas est reciproque et cause, c’est assavoir l’une du mal de l’autre” [“And I beseech those who will read this book, which I call *The Foxes of the World*, not to read one part without the other; for they will ultimately find that the iniquity of all estates is reciprocal: that is to say, the evil of one causes that of the other”] (f. a4^{v}). In the final chapter, the narrator calls on his audience to reflect on the images they have seen, and pay attention not only to their pictorial content but also to the biblical texts that accompany them: “Pensez aux figures dessus declairées, et ne regardez seulement la paingture […], mais aussi regardez les sentences de Dieu, contre vous prononcées par la bouche de David, Ysaïe, Jheremie, Salomon, et autres ses prophetes” [“Reflect on the images explained above, and do not just look at the pictures […], but also look at God’s judgments, delivered against you by David, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Solomon, and other prophets of his”] (f. e5^{v}). Bouchet is following Brant by encouraging readers to consider text and image in conjunction, though the authors construct different relationships between the two media. Brant’s formulaic protestation of poetic incompetence, of his “hoarse song,” subordinates text to image. By contrast, Bouchet seeks to ensure that readers do not neglect the linguistic elements within the woodcuts themselves.

Following Brant’s verse are three chapters that develop the equivalence between foxes and humans. Chapter 1, in stanzaic verse, outlines the abuses that the narrator has witnessed in society; Chapter 2, in prose, explains that the visions of foxes indicate the parlous state of the world; Chapter 3 is essentially a vernacular expansion of the extract from *De spectaculo*, in stanzaic verse; it ends with a prayer to God, in prose. Ten further chapters each present a vision and its interpretation, preceded by a woodcut and followed by a critique of the relevant vices;

each chapter is in prose, but ends with a short poem exhorting sinners to reform. A brief account of two chapters will show how readers form and revise their interpretations of the images.[20]

Chapter 8 is entitled "Des envieux, des usuriers, et des foulx amoureux" ["On the Envious, On Usurers, and On Wanton Lovers"] (f. c4^{r}). The woodcut below this title depicts a fox defecating in a clearing.[21] A partial explanation for this striking image is offered by the biblical text within the woodcut: "Ve qui edificat sibi domum in iniusticia" ["Woe to him that buildeth up his house by injustice"].[22] The apparent implication is that the groups identified in the title all found their metaphorical houses by unjust means, but it is not yet clear how the fox signifies them: is it spoiling its own habitat? The chapter that follows, like all those preceded by depictions of foxes, reveals that what the woodcut presents—including the biblical text—is a scene witnessed by the narrator. Readers learn crucial further information that modifies any provisional interpretation they may have formed: "le renart ayt le texon sur toutes aultres bestes, et pour le chasser hors de fosse y fait son ordure, qui sent si très mal que le texon n'y retourne plus; et demeure la fosse au renart, en laquelle il est après prins par les chiens" ["the fox hates the badger more than any other animal, and defecates in its sett to chase it away. The smell is so disgusting that the badger never returns; and the fox is left in possession of the sett, in which it is subsequently caught by dogs"] (f. c4^{v}). The house, then, is not the fox's own, but has been acquired by underhand methods. While the image and biblical text make sense of the title, the chapter nuances the metaphor by suggesting how both the fox and the human sinners ruin the houses of others. Indeed, the narrator proceeds to elucidate how the fox's human counterparts do this: the envious aim to spoil other people's happiness; usurers ruin households financially; and wanton lovers dishonor women in other households (f. c4^{v}–c5^{r}). A final exhortation to sinners presents "ordure" as the wrongdoings in which they wallow: "ne demourez pas tant en voz

ordures que les chiens qui sont ennemys de nature vous viennent prendre et occire, mais restituez et cherchez autre logis" ["do not remain in your own filth until the dogs, who are your natural enemies, come to catch and kill you. Make amends, and seek out a home elsewhere"] (f. c6^{r}).[23]

The *Regnars*' other woodcuts function in the same way. They invite readers to do what the narrator does—to make sense of the visions, including the biblical texts—with a little help from the chapter titles, which orientate readers' attention but do not fully explain what the images mean. The chapter that follows each image interprets the vision in ways that may supply new information, requiring reassessment of the images. Readers are thereby encouraged to work through the equivalence between foxes and human society so that they effectively reconstruct Bouchet's metaphors for themselves.[24]

The narrator does not appear in an illustration until the final chapter, "Des punicions de Dieu et de sa fureur" ["On God's Punishments and His Anger"] (f. e4^{v}). A sleeping human figure, depicted alongside a lynx and various other animals, reflects the pictorial convention widely observed in illustrations of medieval dream narratives, where the dreaming narrator is represented alongside the content of his dream.[25] The figure's presence at this point is somewhat confusing: the chapter does not specify that the narrator is asleep when he sees the lynx; and illustrations of dreaming narrators tend to appear towards the beginning, rather than the end, of their visions. The most significant feature of this image, however, does not become clear until the narrator begins to describe his vision: "je vy sur le faix de la montaigne ung grant linx tout droit qui regardoit assez effrayement la contenance des dessusditz renars" ["on the mountain peak I saw a huge lynx standing upright, watching the behavior of those foxes in a very frightening way"] (f. e5^{r}). In the woodcut, the gaze of the lynx is directed out of the page, towards the viewer. Bouchet's readers must, in other words, identify themselves as the foxes that

the lynx is watching. This is the culmination of the *Regnars*' moral argument: foxes can represent all kinds of deceitful and sinful humans, but ultimately this means that all humans are foxes.[26]

What do the successive translators and adaptors do with this material? The first translation in the sequence, the *Loose vossen*, gives no indication to readers that it is a translation rather than an original composition. It generally provides a close rendering of the *Regnars*, though a number of exceptions to this tendency are worth noting. Firstly, Bouchet's occasional references to events and situations in France are removed, unless they are simply examples in the service of a more general argument. Hence, for instance, in Chapter 1 the line "Loyalle amour ne voy regner en France" ["I do not see faithful love holding sway in France"] (f. a3^{r}) becomes "Broerlijcke liefde en can ick nerghens ghesien" ["Nowhere can I see brotherly love"] (f. a4^{r}). However, allusions in Chapter 13 to heresy and monstrous births in Paris are retained, as elements in a series of signs that show divine anger and the sorry state of the world (*Regnars*, f. e6^{r}; *Loose vossen*, ff. n4^{v}–n5^{r}). More interestingly, Van der Noot's version abridges a reference to hostilities between France and Burgundy, used in Chapter 9 to exemplify the ways in which flatterers promote conflict, and discreetly shifts the narrator's moral judgment to reflect political attitudes in the Burgundian Low Countries:

> On en a veu les expiriences ès guerres de France derrenierement passées. Le commencement de la guerre des Bourgongnons et des Françoys vint par flateurs, qui mirent discencion et noise entre le bon duc d'Orleans et le duc de Bourgongne, et depuis a tousjours esté entretenue par flaterie, fors depuis la paix et accord de Bretaigne (f. d1^{r}).[27]
>
> [We have seen this proved by the recent wars involving France. The war between Burgundians and French began because of flatterers, who stoked discord and argument between the good duke of Orléans and the duke of Burgundy; since then it has constantly been continued by flattery, except for the period since the peace agreed over Brittany.]

> Dwelcke dicwijls also bevonden es geweest bi experientien, ghelijck dat beghinsele der oerloghen tusschen de Bourgoensche ende de Fransoysen quam mits den flatteerders die twist maecten tusscen den goeden hertoghe van Bourgoingnien ende den hertoghe van Oerliens (f. i2^{r}).
>
> [This has likewise often been proved by experience, as when the wars between Burgundians and French began because of flatterers, who stoked discord between the good duke of Burgundy and the duke of Orléans.]

In both versions, the real villains are neither France nor Burgundy, but flatterers. Nevertheless, by simply switching the protagonists' names while leaving the adjective "good" in place, so that it now qualifies the duke of Burgundy, the Dutch text effects a change in political sympathy.

The *Loose vossen* also departs from the *Regnars* by presenting biblical texts not in Latin but in Dutch. This is unsurprising in a region where Bible translation was much more acceptable to the authorities than in France.[28] The translator seems to have worked directly on the texts supplied in the *Regnars*, rather than borrowing from an existing vernacular source. As the following two examples from the narrator's vision in Chapter 13 show, Van der Noot's biblical verses are semantically and syntactically close to the Latin quoted by Bouchet; they have relatively little in common with those published in the Delft Bible of 1477 or the *Duytsche Souter*, a translation of the Psalms into Dutch first printed in 1480.[29]

Regnars	*Loose vossen*	Delft Bible
Devorabo montes et exuram desertum, et extinguam viride sicut ignem (ff. e4^{v}–e5^{r})	Ick sal de berghen verslinden ende verbranden de woestinen, ende ick sal uutdoen dat groene als vier (f. n3^{r})	Hi sal die berghen verslinden ende verbernen die wildernissen, ende hij salt groeyende blusschen als vyer[30]
[And it shall devour the mountains and burn the	[I shall devour the mountains and burn the wilderness, and I	[He shall devour the mountains and burn the wilderness, and He shall

wilderness and consume all that is green as with fire.][31]	shall destroy whatever is green like a fire.]	extinguish whatever grows like a fire.]

Regnars	*Loose vossen*	*Duytsche Souter*
Nisi conversi fueritis, gladium suum vibravit [*sc.* vibrabit]; arcum suum tetendit et paravit illum (ff. e4^{v}–e5^{r}).	Ten si dat ghi u bekeert, sijn sweert heeft hi gelinstert, sinen boge gespanen ende heft dien bereyt (f. n2^{v}).	Ist dat ghi niet en bekeert, soe sal hi blickende scudden zijn zweert; sinen boge heeft hi ghespannen ende heeften ghemaect.[32]
[Except you will be converted, he will brandish his sword; he hath bent his bow, and made it ready.][33]	[Unless you convert, He has polished His sword; He has tensed His bow and prepared it.]	[Unless you convert, then He shall make His sword shine and brandish it; He has tensed His bow and prepared it.]

Van der Noot's preference for the first person in Ecclesiasticus 43:23, and for the past tense ("has polished") in Psalms 7:13, clearly aligns his renderings with Bouchet's Latin rather than with existing vernacular versions.

One very specific intervention by the translator deserves comment. The lynx, mentioned in Chapters 1 and 13, is designated by the term *lintworm*:

> Saghick een *lintworm* die met sijn oogen violent
> Vervaerlijck aensach tgheselscap daer present (f. a6^{r}).
>
> [I saw a *lynx [/dragon]*, glaring fiercely with its wild eyes at the assembled company.]
>
> Saghic op den hovele des berchs eenen grooten recht staende *lintworm*, die de manieren vanden voerscreven vossen verbaesdelijck ghenoech aensach (f. n2^{r}).
>
> [On the mountain peak I saw a huge *lynx [/dragon]* standing upright, watching the behavior of those foxes very fiercely.]

Though *lintworm* normally referred to a variety of dragon, it was often conflated with *lynx* in Middle Dutch.[34] The term in itself, therefore, does not amount to a mistranslation; but it has an impact on later versions, as I outline below.

A final significant feature of the translation is its handling of Bouchet's verse sections.[35] In the *Regnars*, Chapters 1 and 3 adopt stanzaic forms that are more elaborate than the *Knittelvers* (rhyming couplets) of Brant's *Fuchshatz* or the hexameter of *De spectaculo*, but are not distinctive by contemporary French standards. Chapter 1 is in decasyllabic *douzains* rhyming *aabaabbbabba*; the verse portion of Chapter 3 is in octosyllabic *septains* rhyming *ababbcc* and makes frequent use of epiphonema, a favored technique in French poetry of the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries, in which the closing line of a stanza is a real or invented proverb. The short poems that end Chapters 4–13 are each in one or two stanzas, of varying forms. Verse and prose in the *Loose vossen* are used at the same points as in the *Regnars*, with two exceptions: the poem that closes Chapter 13 is omitted, and a verse prayer is added at the end of Chapter 3. The short poems in Chapters 4–12 are translated much more loosely than the other verse or prose sections. In formal terms, the Dutch verse is less varied and sophisticated than that of Bouchet. Chapters 1 and 3, in *douzains* and *septains* respectively, both adopt the standard four-beat line of Middle Dutch verse. Most stanzas of Chapter 1 rhyme *aabaabbbcbbc*, technically less challenging for a poet than a scheme based on only two rhymes. In the *Regnars*, each poem in Chapters 4–13 has a different form; in the *Loose vossen*, the same form is used for the poems that end Chapter 5 and 7, and for the prayer added to Chapter 3 (ff. c1^{v}–c2^{r}, e2^{v}, h1^{r}). Various Dutch pieces are briefer than their French equivalents, and/or contain more rhymes.

The woodcuts in the *Loose vossen* tend to follow the basic *Regnars* designs quite closely, but the background to each scene is more schematic. More importantly, none of the scrolls bearing biblical quotations appear within the images. Consequently, readers do not encounter those quotations until they read the narrator's descriptions of each vision. Readers are still urged in Chapter 13 to consider the illustrations alongside the biblical texts: "en aensiet niet alleenlijck

de pourtrayttuere […], maer aensiet oock de sentencien ons heeren" ["do not just look at the pictures […], but also look at Our Lord's judgments"] (f. n3^{v}). However, this process now entails linking the images to the narrative account that follows them, not to linguistic elements within the woodcuts. Comparison between Chapters 8 and 13 in the French and Dutch versions shows that this change has a significant effect on the reading experience. Viewers of the woodcut accompanying Chapter 8 (f. h1^{v}) are no longer in quite the same position as the narrator: they can see the fox, but not the biblical text, that appeared in his vision. Although they face many of the same interpretive challenges as those posed by the *Regnars*—connecting the chapter title to the woodcut, revising provisional readings of the image in light of the narrative account—they have fewer cognitive operations to perform before reading the chapter. The biblical quotations do not form part of the initial enigmas; they are read only in mediated form, as part of the narrator's account of his vision, and indeed in the narrator's own Middle Dutch rather than in Latin. For these reasons, the moralizing discourse of the *Loose vossen* is more monological than in the *Regnars*, where the untranslated Vulgate quotations in the woodcuts give the work a stronger polyphonic quality, similar to that of contemporary Latin humanist publishing.[36] As for Chapter 13, the scene depicted by the woodcut is simplified: the sleeping narrator no longer appears (f. n2^{r}). But the shock effect of the lynx's depiction remains: it again looks out of the page, identifying readers with foxes.

By the time the *Loose vossen* appeared in a German translation, a generation later, the Reformation was well under way in many areas of western Europe. Herman Gülfferich, who first published the *Losen füchsen*, tended to print vernacular didactic material in accessible formats, including work by Luther; hence, it is hardly surprising to see that the German text has a broadly Protestant agenda.[37] This is signaled on the title page in one of the states of Gülfferich's edition,

which bears the woodcut designed for Chapter 7, showing two foxes dressed as monks.[38] The title page of the other state bears the woodcut designed for Chapter 11, depicting foxes picnicking with shepherdesses while a wolf steals a sheep from the flock they have left unguarded.[39] Both title pages present the work explicitly as a translation: "für 31 jaren auff niderlendische sprach beschrieben und gedruckt, jetzt aber in guote teutsche sprach transsferiert" ["written in Dutch and printed thirty-one years ago, but now translated into good German"] (f. A1^{r}). The German prose generally follows its Dutch source closely, though there are some doctrinally inspired variations, particularly in Chapter 10 (ff. O2^{v}–P3^{r}), which shifts its focus from those who infringe the privileges of the Church to venality and impiety within the clergy. Each chapter is now designated a *Traktat* [treatise], and divided into numbered parts called *Capitel* [sections], which in most cases correspond to the subheadings that already existed in the *Regnars* and *Loose vossen*. Marginal annotations have been added to most chapters, to signal topics of especial interest and the sources of the biblical quotations. The verse sections are very different: the broad sense of the source is maintained, but the forms used are traditional German ones, less elaborate than Bouchet's and Van der Noot's stanzas. They include *Knittelvers* (Chapters 1, 5, 7, 12); *Schweifreimstrophen*, based on the rhyme scheme *aabccb*, common in Protestant hymns of the period (Chapters 1, 3, 6, 8); and variants of the *Vagantenstrophe*, rhyming *xaxa xbxb* … or *abab cdcd* … in alternating four- and three-beat lines, which had strong associations with folk song (Chapters 1, 11).[40] The German verse also has a much more concrete character than that of previous versions. The translator introduces vivid physical motifs that have no precedent in the equivalent passages of French and Dutch, for example when describing how usurers, fornicators, and the envious will react at the Last Judgment:

Den wolt man gern verkriechen sich
Biss uber die ohren in den schlych,
Man findet aber kein lücken (f. N1[r]).

[Then people will want to crawl away and hide, keeping their heads right down; but they will not find a single cranny.]

As in the *Loose vossen*, Biblical quotations have been translated directly from the previous version rather than adopted from a vernacular Bible. The texts from Ecclesiasticus and Psalms reproduced in Chapter 13 are closer to the syntax of the *Loose vossen*, quoted above, than to that of the Lutheran Bible.

Losen füchsen	Lutheran Bible
Ich will die berg fressen, und die wüsten verbrennen, und alles was grün ist verdürren, wie ein fewr (f. T4[r]).[41]	Er verderbt die gebirge, und verbrennet die wüsten, und verderret alles was grün ist, wie ein feur.[42]
[I shall devour the mountains and burn the wilderness, and I shall wither whatever is green like a fire.]	[He destroys the mountains and burns the wilderness, and withers whatever is green like a fire.]

Wa ihr euch nit bekeret, so hat er sein schwerd gewetzet, und seinen bogen gespannen und zylet (f. T3[v]).	Wil man sich nicht bekeren, so hat er sein schwerd gewetzt, und seinen bogen gespannet und zilet.[43]
[Unless you convert, He has sharpened His sword; He has tensed His bow and aimed it.]	[If people do not want to convert, He has sharpened His sword; He has tensed His bow and aimed it.]

Gülfferich's woodcuts—of which the designer, like those of the *Regnars* and *Loose vossen* blocks, is unknown—are more detailed than in the *Loose vossen*, and contain more muscular figures, but otherwise follow Van der Noot's images closely. Occasional variations suggest that the designer was not working from the visual sources alone, but had read the text attentively: the woodcut for Chapter 6, for example, depicts a single fox being chased by dogs,

which corresponds exactly to the narrative but which the previous versions had illustrated with an image of two or more foxes (f. G3^{r}).[44] Significantly, in the four woodcuts where foxes are depicted in human clothing, their tails are always visible (ff. F1^{r}, I3^{v}, P3^{r}, R1^{v}); this is never the case in the corresponding images in the *Regnars* and the *Loose vossen*.[45] The juxtaposition of tails and clothes underlines the motif in Brant's poems, taken up in Bouchet's Chapter 3, that a fox can change its fur but not its nature. It is further highlighted on the different title pages of Gülfferich's edition, where the foxes are dressed as monks or shepherds. Each title page is printed in black and red, as was the case for most of Gülfferich's publications from this time onwards.[46] Red is used to pick out particular details; in both cases, these include the foxes' tails.[47]

Following the Dutch version, Gülfferich's woodcuts contain no scrolls. The interpretive process is, accordingly, much the same as for the *Loose vossen*: readers have fewer elements to consider than in the *Regnars* before they proceed from each illustration to the chapter that it introduces. In Chapter 13, however, the text-image relationship is quite different. This is partly because the woodcut departs significantly from its source. Its designer has again read the text carefully. The German description of the narrator's vision follows the Dutch account by using the term *lintwurm*: "[E]rsahe ich auff dem giffel des bergs ein grossen Lindtwurm auffrecht stehend, der das wesen der vorgeschriebenen Füchsen starrig gnuog ansahe" ["On the mountain peak I saw a huge dragon standing upright, watching the behavior of those foxes very harshly"] (f. T3^{v}). Accordingly, the woodcut depicts not a lynx but a dragon (f. T3^{r}).[48] Perhaps because of this change, the small dragon that figured alongside the lynx in earlier blocks has disappeared from the image, though it still figures in the narrator's account of his vision (f. T4^{r}). A second intervention by the designer has an even more significant effect. The text describes the dragon as

watching the foxes balefully, like the lynx in the French and Dutch versions; but in the woodcut, it is watching a fox depicted *within* the pictorial space. The opportunity to shock readers by identifying them with foxes has been lost.

The 1606 edition follows Gülfferich's text, with only modest linguistic updating and a few substantive changes: the extract from *De spectaculo* is absent, the prose prayer is omitted from Chapter 3, and marginal annotations are much fewer in number. Its woodcuts generally copy the 1546 images closely, though in Chapters 4 and 5 the compositions have been reversed (ff. B7^{v}, D2^{v}).[49] Otherwise the only major variant is in Chapter 13, where the *lintwurm*'s bow is tensed and has an arrow in it, in contrast with the Gülfferich image (f. O4^{v}).[50]

Much more significant alterations to Gülfferich's edition are made for Stöckel's 1585 version. The opening sections are radically reorganized: Chapter 1 is removed entirely, with the verse portion of Chapter 3 moving into its place; then an editorial preface is added before Chapter 2. These interventions reduce the work's formal diversity, since Gülfferich's Chapter 1 had contained a quite bewildering variety of verse forms. They also enhance the prominence of the fox metaphor, because the extract from *De spectaculo* is now followed immediately by the vernacular chapter that expands on it. The new preface underlines the importance of the images, not only as educational tools but also as artistic products in their own right: "Weil auch diss Büchlein mit Eylff Figuren gezieret, und die vor Alters, weil die Künste jetziger Zeit sehr hoch gestiegen, nicht sonderlichs ansehen gehabt, habe ich dieselben auffs newe Reyssen und Schneiden lassen" ["Because this little book was also adorned by eleven images, which did not look particularly impressive because of their age—since today's arts have reached a very high level—, I have had these redesigned and recut"] (f. B2^{v}). The editor's reference to eleven images includes not only those depicting the narrator's ten visions, but also a woodcut depicting the

author praying to God (f. C1^{r}).[51] This is a reversed and more elaborate version of a two-part image in Gülfferich's edition, which has no source in the *Loose vossen* (f. C4^{v}).[52] In Stöckel's image, the author is represented as an old man; this reflects the way in which he is characterized in the editorial preface, as I outline below. By contrast, the beardless figure in Gülfferich's illustration more closely reflects the claim of Bouchet's narrator that he is not yet thirty years old; a claim that is absent from Stöckel's edition, as it figures in Chapter 1. In keeping with the 1585 editor's insistence on the significance of the images, the chapters devoted to visions are now entitled *Figuren* [figures]. Stöckel maintains Gülfferich's substructure of *Capitel* in these ten chapters, and indeed makes it more prominent: placed immediately after the woodcut that begins each chapter is a table of the *Capitel* that follow.

The work's Lutheran orientation is reinforced, particularly by the preface. The editor explains that the book was not by Luther himself, as he claims some people to believe, but had first appeared in Dutch. He points out that the author's positions do not always coincide with Luther's, though his piety and learning, as well as his experience of life, are beyond question:

> Auch ist dieser Scribent, wie in dem alten Exemplar, so hernach in hoch deutsche Sprach gebracht, zusehen, viel einer andern meinunge gewest, dann der Herr Doctor Luther seliger. Doch mus derselbe Scribent gewiss ein frommer Gottsfürchtiger, gelerther und belesener Mann, auch der Welt hendel kündig und erfahren, gewest sein (f. B2^{r}).
>
> [Moreover, the author—both in the old source and as later rendered into High German—was visibly often of a different opinion than Dr. Luther of blessed memory. Yet this writer must have been pious, God-fearing, learned, and well-read, and also knowledgeable and experienced in the ways of the world.]

Although the editor does not present the *Losen füchsen* as a product of Lutheranism, he thus clearly positions it as a kind of proto-Reformation text. Contributing to this positioning are various additions and changes elsewhere, for example in the prayer that closed Chapter 3 in

previous versions, now placed immediately after Chapter 2. Inserted into the prayer is a clear reference to the "community of the faithful," an important concept in Protestant thought albeit not unique to it: "das ich mich widerumb zu deiner Heiligen Christlichen Kirchen kehren, *und zu der Gemeine treten, die da einhellig glauben und bekennen, welche ihme der Herr Christus Jesus durch sein thewres Blut erworben, versamlet und erhelt*" ["that I return to Thy holy Christian church, *and to the community there that unanimously believes and professes its faith in what Lord Jesus Christ acquired, assembled, and recovered for it through His precious blood*"] (f. C1^{v}, addition in italics).[53] More generally, the language of the translation has been thoroughly updated, in respect not only of spelling but also of vocabulary and syntax.[54]

The redesigned woodcuts include the essential motifs from earlier versions. As in the Gülfferich edition, foxes' tails are visible in the woodcuts when they wear human clothing. But by comparison with all earlier versions, the basic motifs are set in much more fully developed landscapes, often with more human activity in the background. In the woodcut for Chapter 7, the foxes dressed as monks are now surrounded by a cityscape (f. H3^{r}); in the courtroom scene depicted in the Chapter 12 illustration, a water mill has been added (f. P4^{v}). These features give readers far more to think about as they try to make sense of the scenes depicted. In particular, they encourage reflection on the social contexts and consequences of the foxes' behavior. That behavior is more difficult to identify with confidence than in earlier versions, since the images are not preceded by the chapter titles that suggest an overarching interpretation as in previous editions, but are immediately followed by a list of the chapter's *Capitel*. Readers of Stöckel's edition therefore have a much wider range of potential interpretive perspectives to link to a given image as well as more detail in the image itself. As a result, they may generate any number of provisional interpretations before proceeding to read the chapter.

This is particularly clear in Chapter 4, of which the title in the *Regnars* gives a clear sense of its purport: "Des murmures, blasphemes, et envies du commun peuple, et de la dissolucion de ses habis, causans sa destruction" ["On the Discontent, Blasphemy, and Envy of Common Folk, and the Degeneracy of Their Dress, which Bring about Its Downfall"] (f. a6^{r}). In each previous version, the woodcut depicting the narrator's vision is relatively straightforward. Three foxes are represented walking upright in open countryside, carrying baskets and bags full of fox tails; the subsequent chapter explains that the foxes are strewing tails on the ground, and that these represent sins. Stöckel's woodcut depicts a much busier agricultural scene: besides the foxes walking, it includes a fox operating a hand plough, and another harrowing with a yoke of oxen (f. C2^{v}).[55] Viewers will inevitably reflect on what the plough and harrow might mean. The subsequent list of *Capitel* offers possible solutions: each of the vices singled out in these different sections is a potential match for one or other of the various agricultural activities in the image. Might harrowing, for instance, somehow represent "Murren" ["discontent"] as treated in the first *Capitel*, or "Gottslesterung" ["blasphemy"] as treated in the seventh (f. C3^{r})? Consequently, the readers of Stöckel's edition are tacitly invited to do much more preliminary interpretive work than those of Gülfferich's. In Chapter 13, the scene has been reversed and contains a wider variety of animals, including a stag, monkey, hare, and goat (f. S2^{v}). More importantly, the single fox represented in the 1546 edition has become two foxes, positioned in the center foreground with their backs to the viewer, and hence looking in the same direction as readers. Even though the dragon is not depicted looking directly at the foxes—contrary to the indication in the narrative account, which reads almost identically to the 1546 edition at this point (f. S3^{v})—the foxes' positioning restores, to some extent, their association with readers that was so powerfully established in the Paris and Brussels woodcuts.

From Basel in the late fifteenth century to Dresden in the late sixteenth and beyond, the relationship between text and image in the *Regnars* tradition undergoes significant shifts that make different demands of readers and viewers. Brant's broadside combines multiple motifs in a single woodcut, within which scrolls primarily convey the direct discourse of the symbolic foxes. Bouchet sets a series of simpler illustrations in a much more fully developed narrative, the readers of which must manage a rich body of information—pictorial elements, Latin biblical texts within the cuts, chapter headings, wider narrative and didactic contexts—to construct the didactic metaphors. By removing scrolls from the woodcuts and supplying the biblical texts only in Dutch, Van der Noot reduces the interpretive challenge that readers must face, and enhances the mediating role of the narrator. Gülfferich's edition does not significantly adjust the textual elements that have a direct bearing on each image, other than by adding occasional Protestant perspectives; but its more detailed woodcuts enrich the potentially significant visual information available to readers, notably by introducing the motif of visible tails whenever foxes wear human clothing. The explicitly Lutheran orientation of Stöckel's edition shapes the ideological significance that readers will attach to the visual metaphors; but even more significant for the interpretive process are the much more detailed images in this edition, the removal of chapter titles before those images, and the lists of *Capitel* that follow them, all of which multiply the provisional interpretations that readers may generate before proceeding to the chapters. In one sense the story of the *Regnars*' avatars is, like any textual tradition, a story of reception. But in a more specific and much more significant sense, it is a story of multimodal translation, rich in implications for research into the transmission of early modern text-image combinations across languages and cultures. By "combinations" I mean iconotexts in which both the visual and the verbal components exhibit significant continuity from one occurrence (edition, translation,

adaptation) to another.[56] These combinations are fundamentally different from cases in which one component remains the same across different occurrences, while the other changes; for instance, when a particular woodblock is recontextualized in different printed books or within the same book.[57]

It is evident that the successive versions of the *Regnars* cannot be adequately analyzed via existing theories of multimodal translation, which are based on the principle of "interpretive resemblance" outlined above. This principle is simply inapplicable to the *Regnars*, as we have seen; nor does it reflect the normal practice of pre-modern literary translators.[58] Moreover, models of multimodal translation tend to be somewhat unspecific when considering the ways in which images produce meanings, and do not lend themselves well to substantial texts in which meanings cannot be apprehended all at once but unfold over the timeflow of reading.[59] When examining a multimodal textual tradition such as that leading from Brant to Stöckel—where translations are both interlingual and intralingual (Gülfferich–Stöckel), both direct and indirect (*Regnars–Losen füchsen*)—, there is no substitute for philological attention to the material conditions of a text's publication and transmission, and to the fine detail of textual variation.[60] Yet philologists should not stop at this. They need to contribute their expertise to the field of multimodal translation studies, and give it the transhistorical perspective that it desperately needs. This will involve enriching techniques for analyzing verbal-visual interactions, by pointing towards approaches that have been effectively used with pre-modern multimodal texts (but are not at all specific to them). Two principles are particularly important in this respect. Firstly, interpretive resemblance is not a universal translational principle: a translation that appears inadequate on those grounds may have been produced according to quite different criteria, and call for analysis in appropriately different terms. Secondly, reading an iconotext—

whether in its original language or in translation—is not always a rapid act of apprehension, but can be an ongoing process that is subject to revision and refinement before it is completed. Ultimately, two versions of multimodal translation studies are at stake: its current incarnation, largely dominated by presentist assumptions, and a diversified theory and practice informed by philology. The contrast might be represented by two animals that Isaiah Berlin famously associated with contrasting intellectual stances. In the presentist corner, the animal that "knows one big thing," emblematic of thinkers who "relate everything to a single central vision": the hedgehog. In the philological corner, the animal that "knows many things," representative of those who adopt a "centrifugal rather than centripetal" approach … the fox.[61]

NOTES

[1] Brown, *Poets, Patrons, and Printers*, pp. 21–33.
[2] Ibid., and Winn, *Anthoine Vérard*, pp. 78–81.
[3] Armstrong, *Technique and Technology*, pp. 205–6.
[4] The Universal Short Title Catalogue (USTC) reference numbers of the successive editions are: Paris: Anthoine Vérard, [1503–04], USTC 8307 (other states: USTC 26021, 26052, 88451); Paris: Michel Le Noir, 1504, USTC 39000; Paris: Philippe Le Noir, 1522, USTC 30903; Paris: Philippe Le Noir for Denis Janot, 1530, USTC 10447 and 31353. On Bouchet's revised manuscript version, Poitiers, Médiathèque François-Mitterrand, ms. 440 (https://patrimoine.bm-poitiers.fr/doc/SYRACUSE/1050845/les-renards-traversants-bouchet-jean-1476-1557), see Armstrong, *Technique and Technology*, pp. 169–74. All references to the *Regnars* are to the Vérard edition. Page references from this edition are cited parenthetically in the text. Orthography and punctuation in all quotations from early editions are normalized in accordance with standard editorial practice. Translations into English are my own except for those of Latin Biblical verses, which are from *Douai-Reims*.
[5] Brant, *Von dem Fuchshatz*, USTC 743672; Brant, *Varia carmina*, USTC 743678, ff. h1^{v}–h3^{v}. Brant's German and Latin poems are edited, with a translation accompanying the Latin, in Sack, *Sebastian Brant*, pp. 197–211. Quotations are from Sack's versions, with punctuation amended.
[6] Bouchet, *Loose vossen*, USTC 436964. Page references from this edition are cited parenthetically in the text.
[7] Bouchet, *Von den losen füchsen*, USTC 703255; other state: 703256. Page references from this edition are cited parenthetically in the text.
[8] Bouchet, *Von den losen füchsen*, USTC 2105372. Page references from this edition are cited parenthetically in the text. An edition from fully 75 years later exists, and bears the title *Eines*

alten tugendhafften teutschen rechtmäßiger Eifer uber die losen Füchse dieser Welt [*A Fitting Criticism, by a Virtuous Old German, of The Treacherous Foxes of This World*]. Since this appeared so long after the previous edition, and does not exhibit significantly new features, I do not consider it in detail here.

[9] Bouchet, *Von den losen füchsen*, USTC 703254. See also Kronenberg, "Loose vossen"; Menke, *Bibliotheca Reinardiana Teil I*, pp. 89–93; and Schmidt, *Bücher aus der Frankfurter Offizin*, pp. 95, 360–61.

[10] A brief account of this process of transmission is provided in Lizinski, "Umsetzung." Lizinski's study is essentially descriptive, and focuses largely on Brant's broadside and the 1546 German version, but makes some remarks on translators' interventions elsewhere (p. 147).

[11] The classic study of images in multimodal contexts, much revised in successive editions, is Kress and Van Leeuwen, *Reading Images*.

[12] Gutt, *Translation and Relevance*, p. 106; Dicerto, *Multimodal Pragmatics*, pp. 54–57.

[13] Reception studies is most closely associated with Hans Robert Jauss, and specifically in English- and French-speaking academia with his *Toward an Aesthetic of Reception*. By contrast, my account of the ways in which readers process the specific text-image interactions in the *Regnars* tradition is mainly underpinned by the work of Wolfgang Iser, notably *The Implied Reader* and *The Act of Reading*.

[14] Sack, *Sebastian Brant*, pp. 11–12.

[15] Ibid., 153–56; Gabaude, "Stratégie médiatique," pp. 451–55.

[16] Sack, *Sebastian Brant*, pp. 158, 182–84.

[17] Brant, *Von dem Fuchshatz*; *titulus*, upper left.

[18] On all three motifs, see Sack, *Sebastian Brant*, pp. 162, 164, 168–72, 179.

[19] Originally lines 59–62.

[20] See also Armstrong, *Technique and Technology*, pp. 161–68.

[21] See https://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/bpt6k522857/f32.item.

[22] Jeremiah 22:13.

[23] Ibid., f. c6^{r}.

[24] Armstrong, *Technique and Technology*, pp. 167–68.

[25] See https://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/bpt6k522857/f57.item. The convention of representing a dreamer alongside his dream is most familiar from the *Roman de la Rose*, of which various manuscripts include a miniature of this kind near the beginning of the poem. Examples can be accessed from *Roman de la Rose Digital Library*.

[26] Armstrong, *Technique*, p. 167.

[27] The "paix et accord" is the 1493 Treaty of Senlis, concluded between Maximilian of Hapsburg and Charles VIII of France after Charles's marriage to Anne of Brittany.

[28] François, "Condemnation"; Arblaster, "'Totius Mundi Emporium'"; Johnston and Gilmont, "L'Imprimerie".

[29] The Delft Bible (USTC 435295) contains material from the Old Testament alone, excluding the Psalms.

[30] Delft Bible, f. 165^{r}.

[31] Ecclesiasticus 43:23. The verbs in the Latin text are in fact in the first person: "I shall devour" etc.

[32] *Duytsche Souter*, f. a7^{v}.

[33] Psalms 7:13. The *Regnars* reads "has brandished."

[34] *MNW lindeworm*, http://gtb.inl.nl/iWDB/search?actie=article&wdb=MNW&id=26400&lemmodern=lintworm.
[35] This paragraph summarizes the analysis in Armstrong, "'Half dicht'," pp. 20–22, 34–35.
[36] Dauvois, "Voices on the Page."
[37] Schmidt, *Die Bücher*, pp. 66, 259.
[38] Bouchet, *Von den losen füchsen*, USTC 703256.
[39] Ibid., USTC 703255. On the latter state, see Savage, "A Printer's Art," p. 97.
[40] On these forms, see Wagenknecht, *Deutsche Metrik*, pp. 61–75.
[41] A marginal annotation on this page refers to the book as *Eccle.* In the Lutheran Bible, by contrast, the book is entitled *Syrach* or *Jesus Syrach*, and placed among the Apocrypha. I cite the Lutheran Bibles of 1534 (USTC 616653) and 1546 (USTC 616697), respectively the first complete edition and the last on which Luther worked before his death.
[42] *Biblia* 1534, f. J5^{v}; *Biblia* 1546, f. k4^{v} has only minor orthographic variations.
[43] *Biblia* 1534, f. Dd4^{r}; *Biblia* 1546, f. Cc3^{v} reads identically.
[44] See https://reader.digitale-sammlungen.de/de/fs1/object/display/bsb10992552_00055.html.
[45] See https://reader.digitale-sammlungen.de/de/fs1/object/display/bsb10992552_00043.html; https://reader.digitale-sammlungen.de/de/fs1/object/display/bsb10992552_00072.html; https://reader.digitale-sammlungen.de/de/fs1/object/display/bsb10992552_00111.html; https://reader.digitale-sammlungen.de/de/fs1/object/display/bsb10992552_00124.html.
[46] Schmidt, *Die Bücher*, p. 53.
[47] Savage, "A Printer's Art," pp. 94–97 discusses color printing in early modern German book illustration.
[48] See https://reader.digitale-sammlungen.de/de/fs1/object/display/bsb10992552_00143.html.
[49] See http://dfg-viewer.de/show/cache.off?tx_dlf%5Bpage%5D=30&tx_dlf%5Bid%5D=http%3A%2F%2Fdaten.digitale-sammlungen.de%2F~db%2Fmets%2Fbsb10927976_mets.xml&tx_dlf%5Bdouble%5D=0&cHash=28e6680e065c796ef5c730b4b3180d67; http://dfg-viewer.de/show/cache.off?tx_dlf%5Bpage%5D=52&tx_dlf%5Bid%5D=http%3A%2F%2Fdaten.digitale-sammlungen.de%2F~db%2Fmets%2Fbsb10927976_mets.xml&tx_dlf%5Bdouble%5D=0&cHash=2c6c6a7d521b0239bb735e924daf7daa.
[50] See http://dfg-viewer.de/show/cache.off?tx_dlf%5Bpage%5D=218&tx_dlf%5Bid%5D=http%3A%2F%2Fdaten.digitale-sammlungen.de%2F~db%2Fmets%2Fbsb10927976_mets.xml&tx_dlf%5Bdouble%5D=0&cHash=53da4076e351d22b3ef879b96d72b5f6. The 1681 edition follows that of 1606. Linguistic updating is extensive, particularly in the verse sections, the longer of which are quite radically rewritten. Its woodcuts copy those of 1606, though most of them are reversed.
[51] See https://daten.digitale-sammlungen.de/0002/bsb00025758/images/index.html?id=00025758&groesser=&fip=xdsydyztsyztseayaweayaqrs&no=5&seite=21
[52] See https://reader.digitale-sammlungen.de/de/fs1/object/display/bsb10992552_00026.html.
[53] On the "community of the faithful," see Cameron, *The European Reformation*, pp. 172–75.
[54] I am grateful to Felicity Rash for her insights into the linguistic revisions to the successive German versions.

[55] See https://daten.digitale-sammlungen.de/0002/bsb00025758/images/index.html?id=00025758&groesser=&fip=xdsydyztsyztseayaweayaqrs&no=22&seite=24.
[56] The term "iconotext", in the sense of a cultural product in which text and image complement each other, is best known to English-speaking audiences from the work of Liliane Louvel, specifically *Poetics of the Iconotext*. I use the term independently of the epistemological assumptions with which Louvel invests it.
[57] Tran, "Défaire et refaire l'image," points towards the meanings with which a given woodblock can become invested across the range of publications in which it appears, and the connections that its re-use establishes between its different verbal and visual co-texts. On re-used woodblocks, see also Chiron and Maupeu, "L'Utilisation"; and Armstrong, "Love on the Page."
[58] Armstrong, "'Half dicht'."
[59] Dicerto's examples of multimodal source text analysis (*Multimodal Pragmatics*, pp. 105–54) are rigorous and illuminating, but are devoted to short texts, and only briefly elucidate the signifying processes at work in their visual components. Much more exhaustive frameworks for visual analysis are available: see, to name but two widely differing examples, Joly, *Introduction*, pp. 92–117; and Kress and Van Leeuwen, *Reading Images*. As for the apprehension of substantial texts, Iser's "phenomenology of reading," as set out in *The Implied Reader* and *The Act of Reading*, offers a valuable basis for understanding how meanings are processed sequentially.
[60] For a recent example of such approaches to translated iconotexts, see Maupeu, "Traveling Images." On indirect translation, see Assis Rosa, Pięta, and Bueno Maia, "Theoretical."
[61] Berlin, *Hedgehog*, p. 13.

WORKS CITED

Arblaster, Paul. "'Totius Mundi Emporium': Antwerp as a Centre for Vernacular Bible Translations, 1523–1545." In *The Low Countries as a Crossroads of Religious Beliefs*, edited by Arie-Jan Gelderblom, Jan L. de Jong, and Marc van Vaeck, 9–31. Leiden: Brill, 2004.

Armstrong, Adrian. "'Half dicht, half prose gheordineert': Vers et prose de moyen français en moyen néerlandais." *Le Moyen Français* 76–77 (2015): 7–38, https://www.brepolsonline.net/doi/10.1484/J.LMFR.5.111303.

———. “Love on the Page: Materiality and Literariness in Jean Bouchet’s *Amoureux transi* and its Avatars.” In *Book and Text in France, 1400–1600: Poetry on the Page*, edited by Adrian Armstrong and Malcolm Quainton, 95–115. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007.

———. *Technique and Technology: Script, Print, and Poetics in France 1470–1550*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000.

Assis Rosa, Alexandra, Hanna Pięta, and Rita Bueno Maia. “Theoretical, Methodological and Terminological Issues Regarding Indirect Translation: An Overview.” *Translation Studies* 10, no. 2 (2017): 113–32, https://doi.org/10.1080/14781700.2017.1285247.

Berlin, Isaiah. *The Hedgehog and the Fox: An Essay on Tolstoy’s View of History*. 2nd edn, edited by Henry Hardy. London: Phoenix, 2014.

Biblia, das ist, die gantze heilige schrifft Deudsch. Wittenberg: Hans Lufft, 1534.

Biblia, das ist, die gantze heilige schrifft, Deudsch, auffs new zugericht. Wittenberg: Hans Lufft, 1546.

Bouchet, Jean. *Les Regnars traversant les perilleuses voyes des folles fiances du monde*. Paris: Anthoine Vérard, [1503–4], https://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/bpt6k522857.

———. *Les Regnars traversant les perilleuses voyes des folles fiances du monde*. Paris: Michel Le Noir, 1504.

———. *Les Regnars traversant les perilleuses voyes des folles fiances du monde*. Paris: Philippe Le Noir, 1522.

———. *Les Regnars traversant les perilleuses voyes des folles fiances du monde*. Paris: Philippe Le Noir for Denis Janot, 1530.

———. *De loose vossen der werelt*. Trans. Thomas van der Noot(?). Brussels: [Thomas van der Noot], 1517, https://jbc.bj.uj.edu.pl/dlibra/publication/385382/edition/366697/.

———. *Von den losen füchsen dieser welt*. Frankfurt-am-Main: Hermann Gülfferich, 1546, https://reader.digitale-sammlungen.de//resolve/display/bsb10992552.html.

———. *Von den losen füchsen dieser welt*. Dresden: Matthes Stöckel, 1585, https://daten.digitale-sammlungen.de/~db/0002/bsb00025758/images/.

———. *Von den losen füchsen dieser welt*. [n.p.], 1606, http://dfg-viewer.de/index.php?id=2&no_cache=1&set%5Bmets%5D=http%3A%2F%2Fdaten.digitale-sammlungen.de%2F~db%2Fmets%2Fbsb10927976_mets.xml.

———. *Eines alten tugendhafften teutschen rechtmäßiger Eifer uber die losen Füchse dieser Welt*. [n.p.], 1681, https://books.google.co.uk/books?id=pWhKAAAAcAAJ&pg=PA1&lpg=PA1&dq=%22losen+f%C3%BCchse%22+1681&source=bl&ots=gC0p_zWtri&sig=ACfU3U1fkqQtb-cEN33MJPIBl8bjUbIYlg&hl=en&sa=X&ved=2ahUKEwiD8ojosI3qAhVNQRUIHZ-ICysQ6AEwA3oECAgQAQ#v=onepage&q=%22losen%20f%C3%BCchse%22%201681&f=false.

Brant, Sebastian. *Von dem Fuchshatz*. [Basel:] Johann Bergmann von Olpe, 1497, https://www.hs-augsburg.de/~harsch/germanica/Chronologie/15Jh/Brant/bra_flfu.html.

———. *Varia carmina*. Basel: Johann Bergmann von Olpe, 1498, https://reader.digitale-sammlungen.de//resolve/display/bsb11303235.html.

Brown, Cynthia J. *Poets, Patrons, and Printers: Crisis of Authority in Late Medieval France*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1995.

Cameron, Euan. *The European Reformation*. 2nd edn. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.

Chiron, Pascale and Philippe Maupeu. “L’Utilisation des bois gravés: arbitraire et signification dans les premiers textes imprimés.” In *Le Discours du livre: Mise en scène du texte et*

fabrique de l'œuvre sous l'Ancien Régime, edited by Anna Arzoumanov, Anne Réach-Ngô, and Trung Tran, 43–77. Paris: Classiques Garnier, 2011.

Dauvois, Nathalie. "Voices on the Page: Brant, Locher, Badius: Polyphonic Dialogues and Performance in Early Latin Editions." *Le Moyen Français* 81 (2017): 75–105.

Delft Bible: Hier beghint dat prologus vander Biblen des oversetters te duytsche uten latine. Delft: Jacob Jacobszoon van der Meer and Mauricius Yemantszoon, 1477.

Dicerto, Sara. *Multimodal Pragmatics and Translation: A New Model for Source Text Analysis*. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan, 2018.

Douai-Reims: Holy Bible, Translated from the Latin Vulgate. New York: Benziger Brothers, 1914, https://archive.org/details/holybibletransla00newy.

Duytsche Souter. Zwolle: Peter van Os, 1491, https://books.google.be/books?id=nt1NAAAAcAAJ&printsec=frontcover&hl=nl&source=gbs_ge_summary_r&cad=0#v=onepage&q&f=false.

François, Wim. "The Condemnation of Vernacular Bible Reading by the Parisian Theologians (1523–31)." In *Infant Milk or Hardy Nourishment? The Bible for Lay People and Theologians in the Early Modern Period*, edited by Wim François and A. A. den Hollander, 111–37. Leuven: Peeters, 2009.

Gabaude, Florent. "La Stratégie médiatique des feuilles volantes de Sebastian Brant." *Études Germaniques* 74 (2019): 441–57.

Gutt, E. A. *Translation and Relevance: Cognition and Context*. 2nd edn. Manchester: St. Jerome, 2000.

Iser, Wolfgang. *The Implied Reader: Patterns of Communication in Prose Fiction from Bunyan to Beckett*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1974.

———. *The Act of Reading: A Theory of Aesthetic Response*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1978.

Jauss, Hans Robert. *Toward an Aesthetic of Reception*. Trans. Timothy Bahti. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1982.

Johnston, Andrew G. and Jean-François Gilmont. "L'Imprimerie et la Réforme à Anvers." In *La Réforme et le livre: L'Europe de l'imprimé (1517–v. 1570)*, edited by Jean-François Gilmont, 191–216. Paris: Cerf, 1990.

Joly, Martine. *Introduction à l'analyse de l'image*. 3rd edn. Paris: Armand Colin, 2015.

Kress, Gunther and Theo van Leeuwen. *Reading Images: The Grammar of Visual Design*. 3rd edn. Abingdon: Routledge, 2021.

Kronenberg, M. E. "De loose vossen der werelt (Brussel, 1517)." *Het Boek* 14 (1925): 321–33.

Lizinski, Brigitta. "Die Umsetzung von Sebastian Brants Flugblatt *Von dem Fuchshatz* in eine französische Moralsatire." In *Text im Kontext: Anleitung zur Lektüre deutscher der frühen Neuzeit*, edited by Alexander Schwarz and Laure Abplanalp, 142–53. Berne: Peter Lang, 1997.

Louvel, Liliane. *Poetics of the Iconotext*. Edited by Karen Jacobs. Trans. Laurence Petit. Farnham: Ashgate, 2011.

Maupeu, Philippe. "Traveling Images: The Illustrations of Guillaume de Deguileville's *Livre du Pelerin de vie humaine* (Mathis Husz edition, Lyon, 1485) and Its Castilian Translation by Vincente de Mazuelo (Heinrich Mayer edition, Toulouse, 1490)." *Digital Philology: A Journal of Medieval Cultures* 7, no. 2 (2018): 250–64. https://doi.org/10.1353/dph.2019.0003.

Menke, Hubertus. *Bibliotheca Reinardiana Teil I: Die europäischen Reineke-Fuchs-Drucke bis zum Jahre 1800*. Stuttgart: Hauswedell, 1992.

MNW: Middelnederlandsch Woordenboek. Instituut voor de Nederlandse taal. *Geïntegreerde Taalbank*, http://gtb.ivdnt.org/search/.

Roman de la Rose Digital Library. Johns Hopkins University Sheridan Libraries. *Digital Library of Medieval Manuscripts*, https://dlmm.library.jhu.edu/en/romandelarose/.

Sack, Vera. *Sebastian Brant als politischer Publizist: Zwei Flugblatt-Satiren aus den Folgejahren des sogennanten Reformreichstags von 1495*. Freiburg im Breisgau: Stadtarchiv Freiburg i. Br., 1997.

Savage, Elizabeth. "A Printer's Art: The Development and Influence of Colour Printmaking in the German Lands, c. 1476–c. 1600." In *Printing Colour 1400–1700: History, Techniques, Functions and Receptions*, edited by Ad Stijnman and Elizabeth Savage, 93–102. Leiden: Brill, 2015.

Schmidt, Imke. *Die Bücher aus der Frankfurter Offizin Gülfferich—Han/Weigand Han—Erben. Eine literaturhistorische und buchgeschichtliche Untersuchung zum Buchdruck in der zweiten Hälfte des 16. Jahrhunderts*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1996.

Tran, Trung. "Défaire et refaire l'image: l'illustration imprimée à l'épreuve de sa reproductibilité technique." *Textimage, Le Conférencier* 1 (octobre 2012). https://www.revue-textimage.com/conferencier/01_image_repetee/tran1.html.

Universal Short Title Catalogue, https://www.ustc.ac.uk/.

Wagenknecht, Christian. *Deutsche Metrik: Eine historische Einführung*. 5th edn. Munich: Beck, 2007.

Winn, Mary Beth. *Anthoine Vérard, Parisian Publisher, 1485–1512: Prologues, Poems, and Presentations*. Geneva: Droz, 1997.